THE

PLAIN CASE

As it now ſtands in reference to

SUBJECTION

TO THE

Preſent Government:

Wherein is briefly demonſtrated,

That it is not repugnant to the moſt poſitive Texts of Scripture which have been quoted for Loyalty; nor to the known and receiv'd Doctrin of the Church of *England*; nor to the former Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy themſelves, *&c.*

Rom. 13. 1. *Let every Soul be ſubject to the Higher Powers: for there is no Power but of God: the Powers that be, are ordained of God*, &c.

LONDON

Printed, and are to be Sold by *R. Baldwin* at the *Black Bull* in the *Old Baily*, 1690.

Pictures & Sketches by Mr. [illegible]
XUM

The Plain Case, &c.

IF in any Age of the World men ought to be furnished with true Notions of Religious Loyalty, the present Juncture of Affairs especially requires it. And since things are come to such a pass, as that many seem by their Actions to dispute, that Religion and Loyalty are two distinct Qualifications; the first necessary to capacitate us to live in Heaven, and the other to our well being on Earth; I think no time can be more seasonable to discourse on this Subject. In which undertaking, I have proposed to my self; First to lay down a plain and true Notion of Religious Loyalty; and Secondly to shew, how far Subjection to the Present Government may be consistent with it.

As for the first, what is the true Notion of Religious Loyalty: The wise Man gives it us in a few words, but very home to the Purpose, *Prov.* 24. 21. *My Son, fear thou the Lord, and the King.* Whence we may make this Observation: That, if we take the words altogether, as they run; they teach us, That no man can truly fear God, unless he honours his Prince: And on the other hand, that to fear God is absolutely necessary towards paying the King the Honour and Obedience. But if we take the words separately, as they may be divided into two particular Propositions; then they teach us, That we must in the first place fear God; and then in the next place, it is our Duty to fear and honour the King.

If we consider the Office and Dignity of Kings, that they are God's Vice-gerents on Earth, substituted by him to bear rule over the Sons of Men, to prescribe Laws agreeable to his Will, and to see them duly executed; to represent the Majesty of Heaven in things pertaining to the Earth, and that to this End, God has exalted them so far above the rest

Pickering & Chatto 1-2-'34 No. 298 1/6 (£7.6)

of their Fellow-Creatures, as that, Every Soul ſhould be ſubject to them, and none ſhou'd dare to reſiſt them, on Pain of Damnation; and, which is more, that no Man ſhou'd curſe them, even in his Thoughts: If, I ſay, we ſeriouſly conſider theſe things, we muſt ſuppoſe that ſomething more than ordinary is required in our Behaviour to this Higher Power: And ſince God has in his Word ſo ſeverely prohibited all Acts of Reſiſtance, and ſo ſtrictly commanded Subjection and Obedience to it, Whoever acts contrary, muſt throw off all pretence to the fear of God, becauſe no man can be a Rebel on Earth, without being a Rebel againſt Heaven too. But, here we are to conſider likewiſe, that to fear God is abſolutely neceſſary towards paying the King due Obedience. For, God is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; and tho' he does ſubſtitute Kings on Earth, in his ſtead to govern and ſubdue Mankind, yet he does not thereby intend to part with his Prerogative of being obey'd before them.

To illuſtrate this a little; Let us ſuppoſe a Higher Power enjoyning ſome things, which we cannot at preſent think ought to be obeyed; It being our Duty, as Men, firſt to obey God, and next, as Subjects to obey our Prince, if the thing enjoyn'd be ſuch as we ought not in Conſcience to refuſe; the queſtion will be, What Courſe we ſhou'd take to be ſatisfied, whether it be or no?

In ſuch a Caſe as this, I hold it very unſafe relying on that which we are often apt to miſcall Conſcience, becauſe that may many ways be miſguided. And it is near as hard relying on the Judgment of another Man, whom I wou'd make my Friend to adviſe with as to this particular; becauſe he may poſſibly have ſome particular Intereſt one way or other, and if ſo, he will never give the Verdict againſt himſelf, tho' the Caſe never ſo juſtly requires it. Then may we confide in any Body of Men for undoubted ſatisfaction? In anſwer to this, we are to conſider, that all Men, as Men, are ſubject to Error; and in a Body of Men met to arbitrate in the Caſe, the Major part may poſſibly have their dependance on the Higher Power, by whoſe Authority they are ſummoned, and ſo, the reaſon of a few may be forced to comply with, or at leaſt give way to the

Intereſt

Interest of those who out-noise them. Well then, at last, since it is not probable we shou'd by any of these means come to a right understanding; since our own Consciences may be misguided by prejudice, or blinded by Education, and other mens reason may be sway'd by Interest, or out-nois'd by popular Insolence; He that truly fears God, will examin the Injunction by the Law of God; and if he finds it either in terms set down there, or that it is not any way repugnant to it, he may safely, and ought to obey: But, if it is either expresly prohibited by the Law of God, or by any good consequence contrary to it, then he may, and ought to refuse.

To make this plain; Suppose we were Israelites sojourning in the Land of *Egypt*, and had a *Pharaoh* for our King, who shou'd command our Midwives to kill every Male Child that shou'd be born among us: Either this Command of his must be obey'd, as he is our King, whom God has set over us; Or, if we respect the Law of God, and find it contrary to that, it must be denied. If you look into the first Chapter of *Exodus*, you'l see how the Midwives behaved themselves in this Affair: *Verse* 17. First 'tis said, the Midwives feared God, and then it follows, that they did not as the King of *Egypt* commanded them, but saved the Men Children alive. And so in the like Case; If a Prince shou'd command me to murther my Brother or Neighbour, the Law of God says expresly, *Thou shalt not kill:* And if that is obey'd first, as it ought to be, then such a Command of my Prince must be denied.

Suppose again, we were under a *Nebuchadnezzar*, who shou'd set up a Golden Image, and command all Men to worship it, on pain of the cruellest Death if they refused. This one wou'd think has a double Obligation on us to Obedience; First, the Command of a Lawful Sovereign, and Secondly, Self preservation. If you turn to the third Chapter of *Daniel*, you'l see what's to be done in this Case. There were at that time, when this was put in practice, certain Jews of the Captivity, the Chief of which were *Shadrach*, *Meshach* and *Abed-nego*, for these were over the Affairs of the Province of *Babylon*, in Places of great Trust; and therefore under more obliging Circumstances than

others

others of a lower Rank. These three especially were accused for not worshiping the Image according to the Decree. Wherefore *Nebuchadnezzar* in his Rage and Fury commanded to bring *Shadrach*, *Meshach* and *Abed-nego*; and when they were come before him, he said unto them, *Is it true, O Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, That you do not serve my Gods, nor worship the Golden Image which I have set up: Now, if you be ready, that at what Time ye hear the sound of the Cornet, Flute, Harp, Sackbut, Psaltery and Dulcimer, and all kinds of Musick, ye fall down and worship the Image which I have made, well: but if you worship not, ye shall be cast the same Hour into the Midst of a burning Fiery Furnace, &c.* This was a hard Sentence, and enough to affright three young Men into Obedience, if any thing won'd do it. But *Shadrach*, *Meshach* and *Abed-nego* answered and said unto the King, O Nebuchadnezzar, *We are not careful to answer thee in this matter: If it be so, our God whom we serve (or fear) is able to deliver us from the burning Fiery Furnace, and he will deliver us out of thy hand, O King. But, if not, be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not serve thy Gods, nor worship the Golden Image which thou hast set up.* Without doubt their Captivity and Promotions had not blotted the Law of God out of their Remembrance, which in the second Clause of it so severely prohibits all worshiping of Images: And they knew, it seems by their Behaviour, that the Command of a Temporal Prince, was not to carry their Obedience from the Commands of the King Eternal.

Let us again suppose we had a *Darius* set over us, who shou'd make a Decree, according to the Law of the *Medes* and *Persians*, which alter not, That whoever, in the space of thirty Days, shou'd make a Petition to any God or Man, but to himself only, shou'd forthwith be thrown into a Den of Lions to be devoured by them: What's to be done in this Case? If we love our Bodies better than our Souls, and had rather enjoy a Temporal Life at the expence of Life Everlasting, the best way were to obey our Prince's Decree. But the safest Way, certainly is, at all hazard to imitate *Daniel* in this, or the like case; and we find him, (when he knew the Decree was signed, and therefore irrevocable) upon his Knees, after his usual manner, three times a Day before

fore his God, and patiently going to the Lions Den, rather than do otherwise, as knowing well enough, that no Man, or device of Man was to be worshipp'd with holy Worship, and that at all times his requests must be made known to God.

Once more, Let us suppose we had Rulers over us, who shou'd command our Ministers not to preach the Gospel of our Saviour. This may be thought a small matter, only to be quiet, and hold our tongues, and we may be well enough. But we are taught what's to be done in this case, in the persons of St. *Peter* and St. *John*, *Acts* 4. As they were speaking to the People, the Priests, and the Captains, or Rulers of the Temple, and the Sadducees came upon them, being grieved that they taught the People, and preached through Jesus, the Resurrection from the Dead. *And they laid hands on them, and put them in hold till the next day.* The issue of the business, in short, was this: On the morrow, after examination, finding nothing against them, by their own confession, they knew not what to do with them, for that a notable Miracle was wrought by them, which being manifest to all that dwelt in *Jerusalem*, they cou'd not deny it. Well, at last they concluded it their best way, to command them not to speak at all, nor teach in the Name of Jesus; and so they did. *But* Peter *and* John *answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.* And notwithstanding the heavy threats with which they dismissed them, when they came to the rest of their company, they all unanimously bagg'd of God, that he wou'd grant his servants grace with all boldness to speak his Word, *&c.*

These are plain Instances, and several others might be urged to the same purpose; but let these suffice. That which I all along intend, is, that when we are commanded to do, or not to do any thing, which the Word of God either expressly forbids, or expressly commands; or if the Command by good consequence appears repugnant to the Word of God, then we are to deny our Obedience. Wherefore, if I may presume to advise, when we are enjoin'd any thing unusual, we shou'd take great care in examining every

ry

ry particular circumstance, and weigh all things in the ballance of God's Word; that so we may be as sure as possibly we can be, that, in obeying Man, we do not resist the Commands of God; for we must in the first place fear him; and if we rightly do this, we shall, without doubt, take care, in the first place also, to keep his Commandments.

But then, next to our fearing God, we are to fear and obey our Prince, whom God has set over us, in all things that he may lawfully command, and we not lawfully refuse. I shall not here meddle with the Texts of Scripture, which enjoin this, because I design to examin them in another place.

It shall suffice in this place, to observe, That Subjection to Superiors has been of most ancient date. God made a Law, in the beginning, that the whole Creation shou'd be subject to Man, as the Superior Being, and more like the Creator than the rest of his Fellow-Creatures. Nay, before that, there was a Government establish'd in Heaven, wherein the Angels were to be subject to God; and we find, those that wou'd not, were cast out, and are to remain irrecoverably lost in eternal misery! So it is likewise necessary, for the preservation of Peace and Life, that there shou'd be a Government on Earth, in which, by good and wholsom Laws, Men of an inferior station shou'd be subject to, and duly obey their Superiors: And in States Monarchical, when one is head of all the rest, all shou'd yield dutiful obedience to that one, in all things not repugnant to the Laws of God. I say, in all things not repugnant to the Laws of God; for no Prince may enjoin his Subjects, or expect from them, as his due, any thing contrary to God's Laws; but every Prince ought so to model his desires, that they may be conformable to them. Neither may every Man be his own Judge in the case, to determine with himself what Commands are lawful, or what are not: For every ordinary Capacity cannot make Distinctions, infer Consequents, nor judge by Circumstances; wherefore 'tis necessary that the Ignorant shou'd submit to the more knowing and learned, and be guided by them in affairs of this kind. But the more ingenuous, who are well acquainted with, and capable of giving a right interpretation of God's

Laws,

Laws, may be their own Judges: And to ſuch I ſpeak, when I ſay, that Men ſhou'd examin Humane Inſtitutions by the Divine Will revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and wherein they find them agreeable to that Rule, in that particular to obey; but wherein they appear repugnant to it, therein to deny their obedience. And, by the way, I deſire it may be obſerved, that when I ſay any thing of not obeying Unlawful Commands, I intend nothing of reſiſting Lawful Authority. But, in a word, the ſum of all I have urged hitherto, amounts to this: That he who ſooths his Prince in the purſuit of ends contrary to the Law of God, is ſo far from being truly Loyal to him, that he only flatters him to his detriment: And on the other hand, he who from a blind and miſtaken Zeal for Religion, refuſes to obey him, when he lawfully may, and ought, is ſo far from being what he may pretend to be, truly Religious, that he may at leaſt be thought to have no true Religion in him. And this I take to be the true and genuine Notion of Religious Loyalty, as it ſeems to be built on the beſt and moſt Chriſtian Principles. And this is the ſubſtance of that Doctrin of Non-reſiſtance, which ſome diſſatisfied Gentlemen plead for, as that which was taught heretofore, and ought not to be contradicted now.

If therefore, in the ſecond place, it ſhall appear, that Subjection to the Preſent Government is conſiſtent with this Doctrin, it is hoped the main cauſe of diſſatisfaction, as to that point, will be removed.

To this end, the buſineſs of this Undertaking will be, to evince, that Subjection to the Preſent Government, is not repugnant to the moſt poſitive Texts of Scripture that have or can be urg'd for Loyalty; nor to the known and receiv'd Doctrin of the Church of *England* in the ſame Caſe; nor to the former Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy themſelves. This, ſome may think a hard task, but I hope a little patience will ſee it throughly performed.

Firſt, that Subjection to the Preſent Government is not repugnant to the moſt poſitive Texts of Scripture that have or can be urg'd for Loyalty, I ſhall only mention the three moſt plauſible Injunctions in the New Teſtament, as moſt to our purpoſe who are under the Oeconomy of the Goſpel.

I begin with that of our Saviour, *Matth.* 22. 21. *Render unto* Cæsar *the things which are* Cæsar's. Whence we are to consider, first, Whom our Saviour means by *Cæsar*; and secondly, What things he means, when he says, *Render unto* Cæsar *the things which are* Cæsar's. It is certain, that the *Roman* Yoke, under which the *Jews* then labour'd, was not in their account a lawful Power to them: for the Power which the *Romans* then and there exercised, was usurped by the Power of the Sword. Yet, as all Power is of God, so they were to be subject to the *Roman* Power, and to *render to* Cæsar *the things which were* Cæsar's. And 'tis farther observable, that the *Jews* had then a King of their own, whom, without doubt, they thought their rightful Soveraign; and yet they were to be subject to *Cæsar*. Now by *Cæsar*, is meant not only the *Roman* Emperor, but all other Kings and Princes, who are *Cæsar*'s in their respective Dominions; that is, who exercise the Regal Power. *Render unto* Cæsar, that is, to him that is *Cæsar*, not to him who was, or shall be *Cæsar*: nor is it said, render to your rightful *Cæsar*, but to *Cæsar*; your present Governor, is he, who challenges your obedience. But what is this that we must render to *Cæsar*? From the Context we find, it was Tribute. Now to pay Tribute is the most servile Subjection of all; yet the *Jews* were to pay Tribute to *Cæsar*, as to him, who having over-powered them, had a right to their Persons and Estates.

But the Apostle St. *Paul*, in his Thirteenth Chapter to the *Romans*, handles this point more particularly, *Verse* 1. *Let every soul be subject unto the Higher Powers. For there is no Power, but of God: the Powers that be, are ordain'd of God.* It is not said, Let every soul be subject to the lawful or rightful higher Powers; for all higher Power is supposed rightful, as it comes of God. And we know that *Nero*, who was in all probability the *Roman* Emperor when the Apostle wrote this, was a meer stranger to any right to the Government. Yet the Apostle makes no question at all of the legality or rightfulness of his authority, but says, *Let every soul be subject to the Higher Powers.* And for this reason, *For there is no Power, but of God.* And we must confess as much, if we believe that God governs the World. *By me Kings reign*, says God himself. And so the Apostle goes on,

The

The Powers that be, are ordained of God. Not only the Powers which have been, but the Powers that be: The present Government, is as really of God's ordaining, as any that has been heretofore. *Ver. 2. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God: and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.* As there is no Power but of God, so, by consequence, he that is not obedient to the Power, resists, and fights against God. And certainly he that will venture to resist the Almighty, must needs come off with loss. *Ver. 3. For Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the Power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same.* Here the Apostle shews the Office of a good Prince; that he is by all means to encourage men to do good, and to deter them from doing evil. Now one very evil work is, to refuse Subjection, for this is to resist the Ordinance of God. And to this evil, among others, Rulers are a terror. If therefore we wou'd not be afraid of the Power, we must do good: and if we be subject, we do good, in obeying the Command and Ordinance of God: and for this we shall have praise of the Higher Power to which we are subject. *Ver. 4. For he is the Minister of God to thee for good: But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid: for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the Minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.* Of whom does the Apostle say all this? do's he call the *Roman Emperor*, a *Heathen*, the Minister of God? Yes, as he is the Power ordain'd of God. He is the Minister of God for good: but if we do evil, we must be afraid; and if we are punished for not being subject to this Minister of God, we must take it for our pains. Nay, this we are to expect, as a due reward: *for he beareth not the sword in vain*; but is the Minister of God, to revenge, and execute wrath upon the rebellious evil-doers? *Ver. 5. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience-sake.* And how for conscience-sake? Thus; he is the Minister of God, a Power ordained of God, and therefore we must be subject, that we may thereby preserve a good conscience, void of offence toward God and Man; toward God, in that when we are subject, we submit to his Providence: toward Man, in that we do to him, as we would he should do to us: we are subject

to him, for his encouragement to defend us, and provide for our safety, *Ver. 6. For, for this cause pay you tribute also: for they are God's Ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.* This he still urges as a motive to subjection, their being God's Ministers, ordained of him to rule and govern Mankind. Therefore we are to be subject, and therefore we pay tribute. *Ver. 7. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor.* Just as much as our Saviour had said before, *Render to* Cæsar *the things which are* Cæsars.

Now we are to see what St. *Peter* says on this subject, and then to the business. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14. *Submit your selves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well.* Neither doth this Apostle make any enquiry into the right of Succession; but bids us submit to every Ordinance of Man, without questioning the lawfulness of his authority: it is sufficient that he has authority to command; but we have no authority to refuse to submit. He tells us we must submit, for the Lord's sake. For whoever is our Governor, he is of God's setting up. And so, in submitting to the Ordinance of Man, we do but submit to the Ordinance of God: For his sake we are to submit. For so is the Will of God, *&c.*

Now, that Subjection to the present Government is not repugnant to these places of Scripture, I endeavour to evince thus:

First, That their present Majesties are as rightfully the Supreme Authority of these Nations, as the *Roman Cæsars* were to the *Jews.* This I think cannot be denied by any, who shall consider, that the *Romans* usurped a Power over the *Jews*, against their inclinations: Whereas, first of all, their present Majesties were invited to come and assist us against approaching and imminent ruin. And secondly, when they were here, and our *Cæsar* fled from them and us, the Crown was put upon their heads by our own selves, contrary to their desire. And certainly, if Usurpation gives a right to Subjection, a free conferring of the Regal Power must needs be of much greater force. And it will avail but little, to say, that

that ſome few men, how good or learned ſoever as to other matters, diſſent and remain unſatisfied with the proceedings: For it is well known, that all thoſe men were in a great meaſure inſtrumental to the bringing their Majeſties to the Throne, and conſequently to the driving the Late King from it: And therefore they above all, one wou'd think, ſhou'd be ſatisfied with what themſelves began. But, the late King is ſtill alive: And ſo had the Jews a King of their own too, and yet were to be ſubject to *Cæſar*. And our Caſe is far wide of theirs; for their King did not deſert them, but lived among them, and without doubt, fought for them as long as he cou'd: But ours never ſtruck a blow, but ran away and left us to fight for our ſelves if there had been occaſion. Things were certainly at a very ill paſs, when we muſt ſue to a foreign Prince to come and redreſs our grievances, becauſe we had a King who inſtead of taking off a little Finger which was thought too heavy, wou'd lay his whole hand upon us, if poſſible, to cruſh us in pieces. And then, when the Prince was ſo kind as to venture all he had to redreſs us, that this King of ours, ſhou'd preſently leave us to redreſs our ſelves, what might not we have been accounted, if we had not cloſed with the opportunity? And, when we had no King at all to reign over us, the other being fled from us, on whom cou'd we more juſtly beſtow the Regal Power, than on him, who ſeem'd to challenge it, as one ſent immediately from Heaven to ſave us, and to rule over us? And now he is ſet over us, what ſhou'd hinder our being ſubject to him? 'Tis certain, he is at preſent our *Caſar*, and of our own choice too; and our Saviour bids us *render unto him that is* Cæſar, *the things that are* Cæſars.

But Secondly, That the preſent higher Power is ordained of God, no man will venture to deny, who owns a Providence. And this is the prime motive to Subjection according to St. *Paul*. If God may be allowed the Government of the World; I do not ſee, but that the Preſent Government as it now ſtands, is as much an Ordinance of God, as any other that ever has been ſince the World began to be. But the Apoſtle tells us plainly, that, *There is no Power but of God*; *and the Powers that be* (the preſent Powers) *are ordained of God*. Therefore we ſhou'd be ſubject to the preſent higher Powers,

Powers, as to an Ordinance of God. For 'tis very dangerous fighting against God; and he that resists shall receive to himself Damnation.

Thirdly, as St. *Paul* tells us, we must *be subject to the Higher Powers*, as an *Ordinance of God*, so St. *Peter* tell us, we must submit to every Ordinance of Man, for the Lord's sake. We don't find it any where that a Man may be a Rebel for the Lord's sake; but here and in many other places we are taught to be subject for the Lord's sake. But to whose Ordinances are we to submit for the Lord's sake? The Apostle says, *Whether they be of the King as Supreme, or unto Governours, as unto them that are sent by him*, &c. We cannot find in the Scriptures any mention of a King *De Jure*; but they always speak of the King *De Facto*, as if he were *De Jure*. *Touch not mine anointed*, That is, the Present King (if it speaks of a Temporal King) *whom I have set over you*, for he has a Right to your Submission and Subjection, as he is mine Anointed, For *the Powers that be, are ordained or anointed of God*. It is certain, the Present Power is King *De Facto*; and if we allow of God's Providence, he is as certainly ordained and anointed of God, and therefore is King *De Jure*, that is, one who by his Commission from the most High, of right challenges our Allegiance.

Secondly, That Subjection to the Present Government is not repugnant to the known and received Doctrin of the Church of *England*.

It is supposed, that the Doctrin of the Church of *England*, is not in any Case contrary to the Doctrin of the Gospel: And therefore I urge the known and receiv'd Doctrin of the Church of *England*. For the Opinion of every private Doctor, or other Member of the Church, must not presently, right or wrong, be look'd upon as the Opinion and Doctrin of that Church. And thus, when we speak of the Doctrin of the Church of *England*, we understand those Principles which she has selected and put together, as the Foundation on which all in her Communion must build. And here, there are five Book which contain the full Doctrin of the Church of *England*, and we are bound to no other; and they are, The Books of Articles of Religion, agreed on by the Bishops and the rest of the Clergy of this Realm,

Realm, at two ſeveral Convocations, in the Years 1562, and 1604. The Book of Homiles mention'd in the 35th. Article. The Publick Liturgy. The Book of Conſecration and Ordination of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons. And the Book of Canons Eccleſiaſtical drawn up and ratified in the firſt Year of King *James* the Firſt. Now whatever expoſitions and gloſſes ſome Men have put on any thing contain'd in either of theſe Books, touching the Doctrin of Non reſiſtance; I cannot ſee that they, in any part of them, ſay any thing of a King *De Jure*, before he is *De Facto*. And whatever they attribute to the King *De Facto*, we ſtill own to be due to him, as he is *De Facto*, and as his being *De Facto*, makes him *De Jure* too. This being granted, it may be ſaid, that the Late King, was as certainly a Power ordain'd of God, that he was as really King *De Facto*, and therefore as much *De Jure* as this or any other, and therefore ought not to be reſiſted. Granting this to be true; the queſtion will neceſſarily be, Who were they that reſiſted him? Did not the whole Nation at one time or other oppoſe his Deſigns, and in that reſiſt his Authority? Was his Power limited, or arbitrary? if limited, where's the ſin of oppoſing him in his Deſigns that were contrary to Law and Juſtice? if arbitrary, then the whole Nation almoſt were in continual Rebellion againſt him. And what is the Doctrin of Non reſiſtance? Surely, not to reſiſt, is to obey, or elſe we make it a very hard word. And if it be ſo, then, as often as we refuſed to obey his Commands, we reſiſted his Authority. For either he had Authority, as a King to command ſuch things; or he had not. If he had not, then how cou'd we be Rebels in reſiſting one who had no Authority to command? And if he had, then in denying Obedience to his Commands, we reſiſted his Authority. Reſiſtance cannot be confined to Blows, and taking up Arms, but it extends to Words and Thoughts. If we will be for Non-reſiſtance to the purpoſe, *We muſt not curſe the King in our very Thoughts*, Eccleſ. 10.20. But, did not all theſe Gentlemen, who are now ſo wonderfully grieved and diſſatisfied, pray for the Prince's coming? and when he was come, pray for the Proſperity of the Prince's Arms againſt their lawful Sovereign? Who were they, that, when our *Cæſar* left us without ſtriking a Blow

for

for us, ſent to the Prince to deſire him to take the Adminiſtration of the Government upon him? And what is Rebellion, if all this is not? Rebellion may be in Thought as well as Word, and in Word as well as Deed. And they certainly were guilty of Rebellion, who connived at, and tacitly encouraged it in others. And I dare ſay, had the late King proved a Conqueror, he wou'd eaſily have proved Treaſon and Rebellion upon thoſe, that when they might, did not aſſiſt him againſt the Prince, as well as on thoſe who actually aſſiſted the Prince againſt him. Tho' I muſt confeſs that the Sin which is only nouriſh'd inwardly, is not altogether ſo black as when it is reduced into Action; yet the Nature of the Sin is the ſame, in him who deſires, as in him who appears to practiſe it. So then, if any were Rebels in acting as ſome did openly for the Prince againſt the King, They were likewiſe, if not alike guilty, who wiſhed the Prince proſperity, or did not appear to aſſiſt their King againſt him. After all, then, 'tis cerain that the Doctrin of the Church of *England* does not preſcribe any Rules, touching legal or hereditary Succeſſion, but according to the Doctrin of the Goſpel, requires all in her Communion to be ſubject to the Powers that be; and ſince thoſe very Perſons who at preſent diſſent, have either in their good will to the Prince of *Orange*, or their Actions againſt the proceedings of him whom they eſteemed their lawful Sovereign, approv'd themſelves rebellious againſt his Government and Authority as well as others, I wou'd fain know which were better and moſt commendable, To be ſubject to the preſent Government, as undoubtedly an Ordinance of God, or ſtill obſtinately to continue Rebels, and diſaffected to all Government to the End of the Chapter?

Thirdly, that Subjection to the preſent Government, is not repugnant to the former Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy themſelves.

And here we are to enquire; Firſt, whether thoſe Oaths were obligatory without reſpect to any Condition? And Secondly, ſuppoſing they were, whether Subjection to the preſent Government be not conſiſtent with them?

Firſt, It cannot be denied that the Kings of *England* do always at their Coronation, take Oaths to the People, before

fore the People take Oaths to them. And then it ſhould ſeem moſt agreeable to human reaſon, that the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy which the People take, are but an Obligation upon Condition that the King ſtands by the Oaths he takes firſt. For if we could look back to the firſt King that ever ſway'd this Scepter, he, being choſen by the People, to rule over them, and defend them in their Rights and Properties by good and wholſom Laws, they, certainly oblig'd him to promiſe all theſe things, upon Oath, before they eſtabliſh'd him on his Throne: And then, that he might with the more ſafety and honor execute his Office, it was ſo ordered, that all the People ſhould take Oaths of Allegiance and Subjection to him. And therefore, ſuppoſing this to be an hereditary Kingdom, it will not ſignifie any thing in this caſe, becauſe we ſee by the continual practice of this Nation, that, no Prince, as Heir to the Crown, can take the Government of the Kingdom upon him, till he is firſt proclaimed by the People: nor will he at all be ſuffer'd to put the Crown on his head, till he takes the Coronation-Oath. Nor is the King to the People of *England*, as has been diſputed, like a Father to Children; For, firſt, according to the Law of Nature, when my Father dies, I cannot have another Father: but when my King dies, I am in the ſame capacity of having a King, as I was before: But, ſecondly, a Father may lawfully, in ſo many Years after poſſeſſion of an Eſtate, cut off the Intail; but a King of *England* cannot do ſo by the Crown, without the conſent of the People; which is an Argument, that 'tis at their liberty, after the death of one King, to proclaim another, whom they pleaſe. They do not think the Oaths which were taken to the Father, do in any caſe oblige them to the Son, as will appear, when we conſider, that after the Succeſſor has taken his Oaths, the Oaths of Allegiance are again tendred to the People, which they need not be, if the Oaths to the Predeceſſor were obligatory on the Peoples part to the Succeſſor. So then, if the former Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were obligatory only on condition, they will plainly appear to be void, in many caſes in reference to the late King, which have been too often handled to be inſiſted on here. And if it be ſo, that thoſe Oaths were void, and

 con-

consequently no longer of force to oblige, us to Subjection and Non-resistance, then what can follow thereon, but that it was in the Peoples power to dispose of the Crown and their Allegiance to some other person, whom they might trust; one who would, according to his Oath, study by all means possible to preserve to them their Rights and Priviledges in all Matters relating to both the Laws of Church and state? The Doctrine of Passive-Obedience, if there be any such thing in nature, being this, When a Prince rules according to Law and Justice, no one person, or more, should endeavour to drive on their private ends, either privately or publickly against, or in opposition to their lawful Soveraign, but wherein the Laws of their Country are against their interest, rather suffer than rebel; Rebellion in such a case being one of the most odious of all sins practicable. But on the other hand, when a Prince openly endeavours to overturn and destroy the Fundamental Laws of the Land, by which means the Interest of the whole Nation lies at stake, as this appears a manifest breach of his Coronation-Oath, so I do not see how the People so oppress'd can be said to break their Oaths, if they endeavour to put a stop to his mischievous designs.

But, secondly, Supposing the former Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were obligatory without condition; yet I presume, Subjection to the present Government may be consistent with them,

First, Because they obliged us no farther, than to be assisting and defending all Jurisdictions, Priviledges, Preeminencies, and Authorities granted to the King, *&c.* as to the person that was then our Soveraign. And these Jurisdictions, Priviledges, *&c.* being given to the King by the People; or the Legislative Power, or greatest part of it, it cannot be supposed, surely, that the Law of the Land, gives the King authority to destroy the Laws of the Land; that the People would give their King power to rob and deprive them of their Rights and Priviledges. Then in a word, we were obliged by that Oath, in reference to his person, who then was King, no farther, than to defend him in all his Jurisdictions, *&c.* relating to his Supremacy, as to the executive part of the Law, which is the Regal Power.

But

But Secondly, the ſame Oath obliges us to the ſame Articles of Subjection to his Heirs or lawful Succeſſors. Now, that their preſent Majeſties are the late King's Succeſſors, cannot be denied. If any diſſatisfied Perſon ſhou'd ſay, that they are not his lawful Succeſſors, he being ſtill living, this is to queſtion the Authority of thoſe who being convened, were the repreſentatives of the whole Nation; and if we queſtion their Authority, we at the ſame time proclaim our own Imprudence, to ſay no worſe of it, in referring the Settlement of Affairs to a Convention, which we are now apt to ſay had not Power to ſettle them. *But, we thought they won'd have ſet up a Regency.* Then there wou'd have been fine fighting againſt the King by his own Authority! And how agreeable wou'd that have been to our Oaths? However, *we ought to have ſent to invite the King home again.* And he wou'd have been very ready to come without all queſtion, to have his hands and feet tied; to have the Name of King without Power! If we had invited him back, we muſt have propoſed ſuch things, as the Conditions of his coming, as all reaſonable men muſt needs know he wou'd never ſtoop to. But, 1 *Sam.* 26. 16. *This thing is not good that thou haſt done; as the Lord liveth, ye are worthy to die, becauſe ye have not kept your Maſter the Lord's Anointed.* The great Crime is, that we did not keep the late King while we had him. And what wou'd theſe Gentlemen have ſaid, if the King had been kept in Priſon? For 'tis certain there wou'd have been no keeping him any other way. Did not he endeavour to eſcape and leave us once? And then being brought back again, did not he take the firſt opportunity to go quite away? No body knows the reaſon of it, but himſelf, but ſo he did: And ſome are apt to think, that his ſo doing was a tacit reſignation of the Government. However the Convention whom we truſted to inſpect the matter conſtrued this and others of his Actions, as tending directly to that End. But to apply the Text, which has been urged againſt the Proceedings; *David* reproved *Abner*, for not being ſo careful of his Maſter as he ought to have been, and tells him plainly he ought to die, *becauſe he did not keep the Lord's Anointed*, when he had been but juſt before in his Power to have taken away his Life if he had been ſo inclined. And

thus

thus we may say of most, if not all of the dissatisfied Gentlemen of these times; that they deserve to die as much as we, in that they were in all respects false to their Oaths, and Trust, as well as we, if we were at all. Did not their Oaths oblige them, to do their best endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty his Heirs and Successors, all Treasons and Traiterous Conspiracies, which they shou'd know or hear of, to be against him, or any of them? And did not they know, or hear of the Design of the Prince's coming against him with an Army, and yet were so far from disclosing it, till he suspected it himself, at least, as to wish for his coming, and pray for his Prosperity when come? Either those Private Proceedings, and good Wishes, were repugnant to the former Oaths, or Subjection to the present Government is not. If they were, the Evil is too far gone to be heal'd, and therefore all that can be done in the Case, is, to be more prudent for the time to come, and by way of expiation; Since we were all so deeply concern'd in the late Rebellion, if it was any, so the best way will be, to resolve to be subject to the Powers for the time to come. Especially since we are all in some Degree or other concern'd, in either bringing them in, or setting them on the Throne. We can as yet find no fault with the Administration, but that all things go on well, as if it was God's immediate Work for our good. Therefore, we should submit to his Providence in being subject to the Powers which he has set over us: *For there is no Power but of God.* And if we are willing to be subject, we may certainly as well swear Subjection; this being only an outward Demonstration of our inward good Will and Inclinations. I have here only offer'd such reasons for Subjection to the Present Government, as at first induced me to submit my self. I wish they may be soberly consider'd, and meet with the desired Effect: That all who read them may thereby be excited to be candid in their Censures of others, and kind to their own selves; and every one in his Station may cheerfully do as the Apostle advises; *Honour all men, love the Brotherhood, fear God, and honour the King.*

F I N I S.